

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

The Office Action dated July 7, 2010 has been reviewed and carefully considered. Claims 1-32 and 34 are pending. Reconsideration of the above-identified application in light of the amendments and remarks is respectfully requested.

The disclosure and drawing stand objected to because of the following informalities: the current specification & abstract and drawings do not appear to reflect the actual invention. The Office Action indicates a formal replacement of the specification and drawings be filed. Applicants note Applicants submitted another copy of the International Application No. PCT/IB2003/04102, on September 23, 2008. In any event, as requested by the Examiner, applicants hereby submit a replacement specification under 37 CFR 1.125 in Exhibit A; and replacement drawing sheets have been provided in Exhibit B. Accordingly, applicants request removal of these objections.

In the Office Action claims 2, 5, 15, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The instant claims recite "means for performing 2D handwriting recognition based on the 2D images", which does not appear to have sufficient corresponding structure recited in the disclosure. Examiner respectfully submits that the disclosure merely recites "using conventional handwriting recognition software" as the only corresponding means (please see page 7, lines 5-10 of the specification). In response, Applicants

agree with the Examiner that “performing 2D handwriting recognition based on the 2D images” is the same as using conventional handwriting recognition software. Accordingly, applicants request removal of this rejection.

In the Office Action, claims 1-32 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stork et al. (6,212,296) in view of Okahara et al. (2001/0004254). Applicants respectfully disagree. However in the interest of furthering prosecution of the present application, independent claims 1, 16 and 20 have been amended to recite the limitation of “...*wherein a proper 2D projection plane is derived for each word or character and said proper 2D projection plane is where a distance square of each sampling point, of the sampling rate, is minimal;...*” Support for these amendments can be found at least in the specification on page 9, line 1 – 7. Applicants can find nothing Stork or Okahara, alone or in combination, that teaches the above limitation.

Since Stork and Okahara fail to disclose each and every element claimed, applicant submits that the reason for the Examiner's rejection of claims 1, 16 and 20, as amended, has been overcome and can no longer be sustained. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of claims 1, 16 and 20.

With regard to the dependent claims 2-15, 17-19, 21-32 and 34 these claims ultimately depend from one of the independent claims, which have been shown to be allowable in view of the cited references. Accordingly, claims 2-15, 17-19, 21-32 and 34 are also allowable by virtue of their dependence from an allowable base claim.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all the present claims are patentable in view of the cited references. A Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dan Piotrowski  
Registration No. 42,079

Date: October 4, 2010

/Thomas J. Onka  
By: Thomas J. Onka  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 42,053

Mail all correspondence to:

Dan Piotrowski, Registration No. 42,079  
US PHILIPS CORPORATION  
P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510-8001  
Phone: (914) 333-9624  
Fax: (914) 332-0615